

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6-10, 14, and 17 are pending in this application. Claims 6-10 and 17 are allowed. Claims 4 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,504,847 to Horlander.

Initially, applicants note the Office Action does not appear to have made the cited reference to Horlander officially of record. More particularly, that reference has not been cited on a form PTO-892. Applicants request that reference be cited on such a form.

Further, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowance of claims 6-10 and 17.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 4 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Horlander, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of claims 4 and 14 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. Specifically, those claims clarify the operation of the “second reserve command”. Claims 4 and 14 clarify that the “second reserve command” in addition to “permitting transmission of at least one designated command to said first target device from other controller devices” also operates for “inhibiting communication of other than the at least one designated command to said first target device from the other controller devices”. Such subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example in the paragraph bridging pages 81 and 82.

Moreover, the above-noted features are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art to Horlander. More specifically, Horlander does not or suggest the use of a second command that permits transmission of at least one designated command to a first target device from another controller device, and that inhibits communication of other than

the at least one designated command to the first target device from the other controller devices.

Applicants also note the basis for the outstanding rejection appears to accept that Horlander does not disclose such a feature. More specifically, the outstanding Office Action indicates "[t]he claimed second reserve command recites permitting a 'designated command' but fails to positively recite the inhibition of all other commands. For this reason, Horlander is seen to anticipate the claimed invention".¹

The above-noted claim amendment clarifies the subject matter apparently recognized in the Office Action as not disclosed by Horlander.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit each of amended independent claims 4 and 14, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over the applied art to Horlander.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\SNS\20's\203750\203750US-AM DUE 011805.DOC

¹ Office Action of October 18, 2004, page 3, lines 8-10.